discuss the matter with you.

MS. PARK: Judge, if I may be heard. I think at this point we should do a force order and have him come out, and if he proves to be disruptive, he will, in fact, have forfeited his right to be present and his right to testify. I just don't think — I mean that is our position, and he didn't have any problems coming out before with his hands shackled. I don't really see why he is now having problems with his legs being shackled.

THE COURT: Well, it goes back to what happened last week.

(Pause in proceedings)

THE COURT: There are several issues with the force order. One issue is that there is a team, one team, that does this for the whole City. They are not in the courthouse just sitting around waiting for force orders. They may be here just out of share luck, but they could be in Staten Island. They could be anywhere. So that is one of the issues.

MS. PARK: I have another suggestion. I don't know how amenable this would be, but if — I mean I understand that he is in the holding pends. If Mr. Herlich Your Honor, the Court Reporter, and myself can go back and put on the record the condition of how he would have to come out to court, and if he says that he is still refusing, it would be

on the record.

THE COURT: I see that the court reporter is shaking her head no.

MS. PARK: But I think he would behind bars.

THE COURT: I am not going to make the court reporter do anything she doesn't feel comfortable doing.

Yes, Sergeant?

SERGEANT GELORMINO: The lieutenant is on his way up. My understanding is based upon the officers going back inside that he refused in whole.

THE COURT: The other issue now is can we do a force. So it's up to the lieutenant.

SERGEANT GELORMINO: I believe they started putting that in motion.

THE COURT: How does Corrections feel, and how do you feel about me going back there with defense counsel and the prosecutor to talk to him. Is that something that can be done, or it's not permitted? I don't know.

SERGEANT GELORMINO: Security wise. I mean he is behind bars, you're with me. The only thing I would ask, Judge, is that you don't stand directly in front of him in case he decides to spit which seems to be a very common thing that defendants do when they get this agitated.

THE COURT: Right. If we do that, then we'll come back into the courtroom and make a record in the courtroom of

Amalia Hudson, SCR

A749

_ _

what happened in there because court reporter doesn't feel comfortable going.

(Pause in the proceedings)

THE COURT: Lieutenant, thank you for coming up we are discussing two possibilities. One is a force order, but I'm not entirely sure I see what the benefit of a force order would be. It would just — I guess it would document his resistance but beyond documenting his resistance, I'm not sure that a force order would get us anywhere, anywhere productive.

The other possibility, and I don't know what the rules are about this with Corrections and with court security, but the possibility of me going in there with the defense counsel and the prosecutor just to talk to him and see if we can make a record when we come back in. Is that something that we can do?

LIEUTENANT McKEE: We usually frown upon that only because you don't what he's going to do. If he gets angry have being angry spit at you. You don't know what he's going to do is there. Corrections will be there. I've seen it done. I've definitely seen it done. I would have to check, one, with them.

THE COURT: Would you mind checking with them.

LIEUTENANT MCKEE: I would like to speak to my

captain because it's something usually we don't like to do

because we want to make sure there are no safety issues, security issues but I will look into.

THE COURT: As always I defer to whatever you guys think.

LIEUTENANT MCKEE: I will look into it right now.

THE COURT: Thank you. We'll wait. So the lieutenant is going to look into whether that is something that can be done for the three of us to go in there and talk to him. It's frowned upon I'm told. It's discouraged for obviously reasons, but they are going to look into it any way.

MR. HERLICH: I know I had this once before, Judge. It's been too long ago, so I don't remember the precise details, but I think the whole crew went to speak to the guy who was in the pens about some similar issue in a prior case, but if that is permissible under the Corrections rules, I would prefer that not this court reporter come if that makes her feel uncomfortable but if it's going to happen if we can get a court reporter that will feel comfortable, that's the best way to do it otherwise.

THE COURT: I don't think it critical that we have a court reporter. We can go in there. Do what we have to do and come back into the courtroom and make a record, and we can all make a record of what happened.

At this point the more I think about it the more I feel

that a force order is not going to result in anything productive.

On the one hand, we can force him out here against his will, and he will, if that is the case, he is just to going to continue to be become a disruption, and I don't see how we can stop him or prevent him from doing that.

On the other hand, we try it execute the force order, people get hurt, and not just the defendant, but the court officers get hurt, and he doesn't come out. So I just don't see the benefit to that. I think right now, I'm much more inclined to just go back there and try to talk to him, but I think that all — his behavior now and his insistence on doing this just further demonstrates why it's important that he remains shackled. Although he has not been violent today, he insists on doing things his ways, and he has definitely not deferred to the authority of the court officers up to this point. He has challenged their authority on several occasions, and again what was that language that he used, Sergeant?

SERGEANT GELORMINO: The statement in sum and substance was, "If I don't get out of here, I am going to spaz out and create a scene that will cause a mistrial."

THE COURT: All right. At this moment the lieutenant is checking with Corrections to see if it should be done.

SERGEANT GELORMINO: Just for your information,

Judge an Unusual Occurrence Report was filed which lead to
the increase in the security level based on that statement.

THE COURT: So that was done last week?

SERGEANT GELORMINO: That was done on Thursday of last week.

THE COURT: Okay. I see.

SERGEANT GELORMINO: Basically we go progressive at that point, bunting, shackles and the link.

THE COURT: Again, I realize I made this record several times, but I feel it's important to make it again. He would not be handcuffed out here. He would be sitting at a table that has bunting all around it, and no one, no one in the courtroom will know he is wearing shackles, and when the time would come to testify, he would be escorted to the witness stand out of the presence of the jury. The jury would never see him walking in shackles. The jury would never have reason to know, believe, suspect, he in shackles because his hands would be free.

So he's just choosing to be obstructive at this point.

SERGEANT GELORMINO: The initial was going to be just leg shackles. Based on his temperament, okay, the full level of security which includes the D Belt. The D belt allows the hands to be in front of the body, but the wrists are actually handcuffed to the belt, so his hand would be

handcuffed. They would be in front of the body. He wouldn't be rear cuffed. So he could actually hold things in his hands and hand them off to the lawyer, but the movement would be some what restricted.

THE COURT: Could be gesture if he wanted to with his hands?

SERGEANT GELORMINO: Above his midsection, no, and the reason --

MR. HERLICH: And his cuffs would be visible to the jury I assume, right?

SERGEANT GELORMINO: If he brought his hands up, yes.

THE COURT: But that is now -- that's where we are at now because of what has been happening this morning?

SERGEANT GELORMINO: Yes.

THE COURT: That wasn't the plan this morning?

SERGEANT GELORMINO: No. That was not the plan this morning. This morning, it was going to be initially just leg shackles to restrict his movement, but based on what we were met with, and then his refusal to come out period, even without the jury being present, the threat level was escalated.

THE COURT: Okay.

While we wait to hear back from the any lieutenant, would you like to go over the proposed jury charges?

Amalia Hudson, SCR

A754

4 5

MR. HERLICH: Yes.

THE COURT: Are there any exceptions or requests?

MR. HERLICH: Two requests, Your Honor. With regard to the credibility of witnesses, I observed that there is the classic instructions on prior inconsistent statements.

As I indicated, I think on Friday I did attempt to impeach the witness by — the complaining witness by omission. In that she did not tell Detective Barbato certain things that occurred during the course of the alleged crime that she testify to at trial, and so I would request that the jury may, for credibility purposes, consider impeachment by omission.

The other thing that occurred to me --

THE COURT: Sorry. Let me just -- People would you like to be heard on that?

MS. PARK: No.

MR. HERLICH: The other issue, Your Honor and, I'm not a hundred percent sure it would cover attempted rape in the first degree. I'm still — I think, Judge, will you make a ruling before the summation as far as the motion to dismiss based at the close of the People's case, or would you reserve?

THE COURT: Yes. This is regarding your application that the several charges were multiplications and count five should be dismissed?

Amalia Hudson, SCR

A755

_ _

MR. HERLICH: And count three, attempted rape should be dismissed.

THE COURT: Okay. First of all, I believe that Judge Solomon ruled on this already, and I believe that is the law of the case, however, even if it were not the law of the case after reviewing the papers and considering the research that has been done, I agree with Judge Solomon that the counts are not multiplications and count five should not be dismissed. Hold on a second.

(Pause in proceedings)

THE COURT: If your client does not testify, I take it we need to make a correction, or a change to the section on interested and lack of interest?

MR. HERLICH: Yes, as well as impeachment by criminal history. It really wouldn't apply in this case.

THE COURT: Yes. Anything else?

MR. HERLICH: Yes, Judge, the one think I thought of was a jury instruction on — I think it's called abandonment with — regard to the count of attempted rape in the first degree. If you credit completely the testimony of the complaining witness, she admitted that when she said stop, he complied with her request.

So my request would be that the defendant, if he ever intended to commit that crime, he abandoned that plan or that intent and did not commit the crime. The question is does

abandonment would that cover attempted rape in the first degree. I think that is a close question, but that is my request that he abandoned his plans to commit that crime.

THE COURT: People?

MS. PARK: Judge, I'm not really sure what charge Mr. Herlich is referring to, but if he wants to argue that he can. I don't think the jury needs a special instructions on his plan of abandonment, but by the time that he rubbed his penis against her vagina, our position is the crime of attempted rape in the first degree has been satisfied. We didn't charge him with a complete rape.

THE COURT: Well, and he didn't just abandon it because she asked him not to. She said it hurt he was trying to talk her into it by telling her if she relaxed, it wouldn't hurt, and there was, as I call some evidence about that type of conversation, if you can call it conversation, going back and forth at that time. Nonetheless, let me look into the standard charge on that before I rule on it.

MR. HERLICH: Okay.

THE COURT: People, anything on the charges?

MS. PARK: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So just to go over what the changes would need to be if he does not testify, revise the interest lack of interest, revise the previous criminal conduct, and add the section on omissions. Right.

MR. HERLICH: Oh, based on my request?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. HERLICH: Yes, yes.

SERGEANT GELORMINO: Judge, I just spoke with Captain Garele from Corrections. Whenever you're ready, we'll put it into motion.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's just go in there.

(The Court, defense counsel and the prosecutor proceeded to the pens to speak with the defendant)

(Proceedings later resumed's in open court)

THE COURT: It's now 11:30. I was permitted to go into the pens where I tried to engage Mr. Harrell in a reasonable conversation for about 10, maybe 15 minutes. We did talk. He was agitated. I was just trying my hardest to convince him that I just wanted him to have a fair trial and I want to preserve his right to testify, and I tried to communicate that to him I don't know how many different ways, but he is hung up on the fact that he feels that — these are my words not his, but he feels that he was disrespected on Thursday. That I was the reason he was agitated, and, therefore, I assume he was kidding, but the Court Officer should have restrained me and not him. I did ask him at that point about an anecdote I learned of while I was in the hallway that he turned to one of the court officers last week on Thursday and said, "Do you have to stand so close to me?

I can feel your body. Get away. You're too close. I can feel you breathing."

So again he was trying to tell the court officers how to do their jobs. I was not even aware of that anecdote.

COURT OFFICER: That was Wednesday.

THE COURT: That was Wednesday the day before anything even happen. We were joined by a Captain from Corrections who, in my opinion, did a terrific job of communicating with the defendant. I would ask the Captain if you wouldn't mind making a record of what your dialogue was with him?

CAPTAIN GARELE: I'm Captain's Garele, Shield No. 133, and Mr. Harrell adamantly refuses to appear in the courtroom. The judge as well as the OCA sergeant tried numerous time to get him to comply which he's still refusing to appear in the courtroom.

MR. HERLICH: Shackled.

THE COURT: Shackled.

MR. HERLICH: That's the whole beef.

THE COURT: Yeah. He does not want to come out in shackles. I explained to him over and over again how we would do it. How we would try to make this happen so that he is not prejudiced in any way so that the trial is not tainted in any way, and he was just not having any part of it. He refuses to come into the courtroom shackled.

Amalia Hudson, SCR

A759

1 2

Thank you. Thank you, Captain. I appreciate it.

CAPTAIN GARELE: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Herlich, Ms. Park, you were in there as well. Anything you want it add to the record?

MR. HERLICH: I will just say, you know, to paraphrase the defendant, "I want to testify at trial, but I refuse to come to the courtroom if my legs are shackled." Even though I explained to him and so did many other people this morning that while he's in the witness stand, the jury would not be able to even observe that his legs are shackled so that is his position and he is not willing to compromise on it.

THE COURT: Ms. Park?

MR. HERLICH: Nothing else except just the record is clear that his tone that he was speaking loudly. He seem very upset.

THE COURT: Yes. He was agitated. He cut me off a number of times. Communication with him was not easy, and although I'm sure that other judges have done what I did, it's not everyday that a judge will go into the pens to speak to an incarcerated defendant.

I did that because I genuinely just want him to have his day in court if he wants to testify. I was trying to do everything within my power to find a way to make that happen, but there was no compromising with him. His feeling was no

Amalia Hudson, SCR

A760

shackles period.

I explained to him that this is a serious case. He's looking at significant jail time, that it would be in his best interest for the jury to hear his story, if that's what wants to do. I told him that I felt that he was being a bit foolish, that he was cutting off his nose to spite face, that he was standing on principal here. I personally apologized for anything I said and did on Thursday to upset him or to in any way create the environment that ultimately resulted in his leaving.

I reminded him that he asked to be excused Thursday and we complied. He was excused. I reminded him that he asked for trial to not continue on Friday because of his religious observance, and I did that. The trial not continue on Friday. There is just nothing else I can do at this point it's. Now 11:35. I imagine most of the jurors are back.

So Mr. Herlich I will hear you now on how we should proceed.

MR. HERLICH: Given what has transpired, Judge, I would like to move in front of the jury one piece of evidence into evidence regarding the defendant's phone call history of his phone records, and then I would rest and go into closing arguments?

THE COURT: And how are you going to lay the foundation for those phone records?

MR. HERLICH: I don't believe the prosecutor is objecting to them. Part of them — I believe part of those records are in evidence from certain dates. I was going to move in the entire record from February 6th, I believe, until July 16, 2014.

THE COURT: Okay? People, anything else you would like to add at this point.

MR. HERLICH: Just one second, Your Honor. (Defense counsel in discussion with the prosecutor)

MS. PARK: Judge, just a couple of things. I just wanted the record to be clear that the defendant was told that the trial will proceed if he refuses to come out in his absence.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. PARK: Also I just wanted to file with the Court an updated Rosario list. Iast week I neglected to move in People exhibit 17A. I told Mr. Herlich, and I don't think he's going to object to it. When People's 17 came in, 17A should have come in. It's a photograph of the broken glass.

THE COURT: Any objection to any of that?

MR. HERLICH: No.

THE COURT: So you will introduce some phone records. You are going to introduce that. Before we continue. Just on the — we called it abandonment, but it's really renunciation.

So I direct to your Penal Law section 40.10 (3). "In any prosecution pursuant to Section 110.00 for an attempt to commit a crime, it is an affirmative defense that under circumstance manifesting a voluntary and complete renunciation of his criminal purpose, that defendant avoided the commission of the crime attempted by abandoning his criminal efforts, and if mere abandonment was insufficient to accomplish some a avoidance by taking further and affirmative steps which prevented the commission thereof."

I think that in looking at the evidence that was presented at this trial, it's difficult to say that the evidence supports this instruction of renunciation under Subsection (3). Again the subsection requires a voluntary and complete renunciation of his criminal purpose.

So we are dealing obviously in that count just with the attempted rape, but I don't think that it can be said that he abandoned his complete criminal purpose. What he did from that when that didn't work, he then moved on to a different sexual act which was the oral sex, and he actually completed that act. He actually ejaculated and then used the victim's underwear to clean up afterwards. I don't believe that this is an appropriate charge in this case.

All right. So I guess what we are going to do now is go to summations. I will give the jury a brief three-minute instruction on what summations are, and then you can delivery

your summations.

MR. HERLICH: Can I have one minute, Judge?

THE COURT: Sure.

COURT OFFICER: Judge, jurors number one,
Mr. Alexander, and No. five, Mr. Morais wish to address. One
is about his pay and his job, and the other one wants to
speak to you about a sermon I believe.

THE COURT: A what?

COURT OFFICER: A sermon. He said he was supposed to do it Sunday and they moved it to Wednesday, but at 1:30.

THE COURT: Let's bring them in. Would you mind waiting let's bring in juror number one, and then juror number five.

(Juror enters)

THE COURT: Good morning, sir how are you. It's my understand you wanted to speak to us.

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

JUROR: I was scheduled Sunday because this is Laymen's week at our church to teach the congregation. I found out yesterday that they scheduled me for 1:30 on Wednesday.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUROR: I didn't know — I didn't know whether or not that was something I needed to tell you, and if I would

Amalia Hudson, SCR

A764

4

3

1

2

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

be able to be excused for that day, and if not I just need to know so that I can make a phone call.

THE COURT: Yes. First of all, thank you for bring this to our attention, and I apologize for the disruption to your life during these proceedings.

At this point I don't know whether the jury is going to be done with it's deliberations by Wednesday at 1:30, and once a deliberating jury — once a jury begins it's deliberations, it's — we can't just take time off. You know, we can't just take days off or afternoons off. At that point it becomes very, very difficult to replace a deliberating juror with an alternate juror.

What I can tell you is I expect we're going to continue this morning with the summation, so I expect that the jury will get the case to begin it's deliberations no later than this afternoon. Sorry I can't give you a better answer than that.

JUROR: Thank you, sir.

(Juror No. 1 exits. Juror No. 5 enters)

THE COURT: Good afternoon sir. I understand you want to speak to us.

JUROR: Sure. So my company just made me aware that they're only going to pay for my first 10 days of jury duty, and then afterwards they will not cover me. So it may be, you know, with the State only paying me like \$40, it may

be a financial hardship so-to-speak because I'm not going to be getting paid when I'm accustomed to paying.

So I know we obviously made a lot progress. I already used six of my days. I just wanted to advise you of that. Thank you.

THE COURT: I appreciate that. Is today your seventh day?

JUROR: Today would be my seventh, correct.

THE COURT: So you could work through Thursday, if necessary without that being a problems?

JUROR: Right.

THE COURT: You know, it's very difficult for me to know in advance how long a jury is going to deliberate. I've had juries deliberate for 15 minutes. I've had juries deliberate for a week. What I can tell you is that I expect that the jury will receive the case and begin it's deliberations this afternoon. So if you can put this concern out of your mind and deliberate and not be distracted, I think we're doing okay on time as far as the 10 days.

JUROR: Definitely. It was just one of those things I spoke with the jury clerk, and she advised me to advise you rather to cover my basis.

THE COURT: Okay, and you think you can put that aside and just focus on your deliberations?

JUROR: Absolutely.

Amalia Hudson, SCR

A766

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	THE COURT: Thank you for bring that to my
2	attention.
3	JUROR: Absolutely.
4	THE COURT: You can step out. Thank you.
5	(Juror exits)
6	THE COURT: Mr. Herlich, would you like me to give
7	the jury that instruction again that they are not to drawn
8	any inference against the defendant, or is it sufficient tha
9	I gave it once?
10	MR. HERLICH: I think it's sufficient that you gav
11	it once, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Okay. Let's bring the jurors in
13	please.
14	By the way the verdict sheet has been prepared. I
15	believe the prosecutor has initialed it. Mr. Herlich, can
16	you take a look at it, and if you approve, please initial it
17	as well.
18	MR. HERLICH: Just one thing with regard to count
19	six and seven 7D, is it necessary to put in that the
20	defendant was older than 21 years old.
21	THE COURT: Let me take a look.
22	(Pause in the proceedings)
23	THE COURT: Well, that's an element of the offense
24	and actual in six and seven, we don't put the defendant's

Amalia Hudson, SCR

age. We only put the victim's age. Am I not reading --

1 MR. HERLICH: No, no. I am wondering if it's 2 necessary to. 3 I thought you were questioning. THE COURT: MR. HERLICH: No. Not at all. Not that you put 4 5 that the age of the victim is under a certain age, but that they must also find that the defendant's age, I believe, has 6 7 to be 21 or older. THE COURT: Well, that is an element of the 8 offense, and if you want us to add that, we can. 9 MR. HERLICH: Okay. 10 THE COURT: So we'll add and the defendant was over 11 21 years of age. Ms. Park any observation to that? 12 13 MR. HERLICH: No. THE COURT: So we'll make those changes, and we'll 14 15 continue now with the jurors. So I will allow you to introduce 17A first, and then I will turn to you, Mr. Herlich 16 17 People, how long do you expect to be? MS. PARK: I think 45 minutes. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Herlich how long do you expect 19 yours to be? 20 MR. HERLICH: Not very long, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Panel entering. All rise. 22 THE CLERK: Case on trial People vs. Lonnie 23 24 Harrell. All parties are present except the defendant, and

Amalia Hudson, SCR

the jurors are present.

THE COURT: Good morning, Jurors. Welcome back. I hope you had a good weekend. I apologize for the delay this morning. I know that you were here and you were ready to go, so I apologize for keeping you waiting, but at this time we are ready to continue.

People, do you wanted to introduce 17A?

MS. PARK: Yes, at this time the People are moving in People Exhibit 17A connection having been made.

THE COURT: And there is no objection to that, right?

MR. HERLICH: Correct.

THE COURT: People's 17A is accepted into evidence finding that the connection has been fully made, and you now rests?

MS. PARK: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Herlich.

MR. HERLICH: Your, Honor the defense would like to move into evidence the phone calls, the phone records of the defendant from of February 6, 2014 to July 16, 2014.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. PARK: No, Your Honor?

THE COURT: That will be defense? What are we up

to?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE CLERK: F.

THE COURT: Defense F. Do you now rest?

Amalia Hudson, SCR

A769

PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTIONS

MR. HERLICH: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you please have a seat.

Members of the jury, you will now hear the summations of the lawyers. Following the summations I will instruct you on the law, and then you will begin your deliberations.

Under our law, the defense counsel must sum up first and the prosecutor must follow. The lawyers may not speak to you after that.

Provide each lawyer an opportunity to the review the evidence and submit for your consideration the facts, inferences, and conclusions that they contend may properly be drawn from the evidence.

If you find that a lawyer has accurately summarized and analyzed the evidence, and if you find that the inferences and conclusions the lawyers asks you to draw from that evidence are reasonable logical and consistent with the evidence, then you may a adopt those inferences and conclusions.

Members of the jury please bear in mind the following points. First, you are the finders of fact, and it is for you to determine the facts from the evidence that you find to be truthful and accurate. Thus, whatever the lawyers say and however they say it, you should remember what the lawyers say is simply argument submitted for your consideration.

Second, remember the lawyers are not witnesses in this

PRELIMINARY INSTRUCTIONS

2.4

case. So if a lawyer asserts as fact something that is not the based on the evidence, you must disregard it. Remember nothing the lawyers say at any time is evidence. So nothing the lawyers say in their summations is evidence. You have heard the evidence and must decide this case on the evidence as you find it and the law as I explain it.

Third, during the summations one lawyer's recollection of the evidence may in good faith differ from the recollection of the other lawyer or from your own recollection, and the lawyers will undoubtedly differ with each other on the conclusion to be drawn from the evidence. It is your own recollection, understanding, and evaluation of the evidence, however, that controls regardless of what the lawyers have said or will say about the evidence.

If during your deliberations you need to have your recollection of the testimony refreshed, you may have all or any portion of the testimony read back to you.

Four, remember under our law, I'm responsible for explaining the law. Not the lawyers. If you think there is any difference between what the lawyers may have said or what I say the law is, your sworn duties as jurors is to follow my construction on the law as you have promise you would.

And fifth, if during the summations I sustain an objection to a comment of a lawyer, that comment will be stricken from the record, and you must disregard it as it

were never said. If I overrule an objection the comment will stand. Whether I sustain or overrule an objection, or on my own indicate a comment must be disregarded, my ruling indicates only that the comment does or does not violate one of the rules of law set down for lawyers to follow during a summation.

It is not an attempt to indicate that I have an opinion on what is said, or of the facts of the case, or if whether the defendant is guilty or guilty. Remember under our law you alone judge what facts, if any, are proven and whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty. Not I and not the lawyers.

We turn now to the summations, Mr. Herlich.

MR. HERLICH: Let we begin by reminding you that during voir dire I did mentioned to you that if Mr. Harrell does not testify you can't hold that against him, and I just want to remind you of that at this time.

You may have noticed, I assume, that I just moved into evidence phone records of Mr. Harrell that go from February of 2014 to July 16, 2014, and I just want to briefly go through some of this to just show you that Mr. Harrell, consistent with testimony of both Laketa Smith and Cypress Smith, was sort of a family friend.

On April 22, 2014, there were a total of eight text messages between Mr. Harrell's phone the number ending in

from 3203, and Laketa Smith's phone ending in 7475, and I will just go through it very you quickly.

On that date April 22 at 2:05 p.m. there was an outgoing text from Mr. Harrell to Laketa Smith, and at 2:22 there was an incoming text from Smith to the defendant. Then at 2:50 p.m., there was an outgoing text from Harrell to Laketa. At 2:52 there was another outgoing text from the defendant to Laketa Smith. At 2:53 Laketa Smith sent a text to the defendant. At 2:59 p.m. there was the text of the defendant to Laketa Smith. Another text only seconds later also at 2:59 p.m. from defendant to Laketa Smith, and last, and that was it for — Sorry. One more. There was an incoming text from Laketa Smith to the defendant at 3:08 p.m.

Then on April 27, there was an outgoing voice call from the defendant to Laketa Smith at 1:04 p.m. It was a 44 second call. On June 23, 2014 there was a incoming voice call from Laketa Smith to the defendant at 2:36 p.m. It lasted 37 seconds. On June 24th, there was an incoming call from Laketa Smith to the defendant at 1:15 p.m. That lasted seconds, and on the same date June 24, 2014 there was an outgoing voice call from the defendant to Laketa Smith at 1:17 p.m. that lasted 72 seconds.

Again on the same date June 24, 2014, Laketa Smith called the defendant at 1:23 p.m. That call lasted 67 seconds, and on June 25, 2014 it was an outgoing call from

the defendant to Laketa Smith at 10:42 a.m. That is on June 25 for 75 seconds.

On July 6, 2014 there was an incoming call, voice call from Laketa Smith to the defendant at 3:39 p.m. that lasted one minute and 54 seconds, and lastly on the same day July 6, 2014, there was an outgoing call from the defendant to Laketa Smith at 7:11 p.m., and that lasted 16 seconds.

And this is just to demonstrate that there was a cordial relationship between the defendant and Ms. Laketa Smith and her daughter. The phone communications were between mother and Mr. Harrell, and perhaps that's the only part of this case where there is consistent testimony regarding the fact that prior to July 16, 2014 Mr. Harrell was a friend of the family, and the communications make sense in the context of the friendship between Lonnie Harrell and Journey who was and is Ms. Smith's son, and as you heard Mr. Harrell took Journey to play basketball and ride bikes, and so they had a relationship, so it's only natural that mother and Mr. Harrell had some way of communicating with each other.

Let me address the testimony of Cypress Smith who is the complaining witness in this case. The Judge will instruct you at the end of the case on what tools you can use to assess the credibility of a witness, and one of the tools is called impeachment by omission.

In other words what I attempted to do during cross

Amalia Hudson, SCR

examination was to ask Laketa Smith — I am sorry — Cypress Smith about the fact that she left out some information about the events of July 16, 2014, and for you to consider the fact that she had left out certain events from her narrative that she gave to Detective Susan Barbato at St. Luke's Roosevelt Hospital during the period of time that she was in the hospital from approximately 3:40 — some time after 3 p.m. until shortly after midnight on July 17th, and the medical records will also bear out that at some time during the course of her being at the hospital, she similarly gave a narrative that left out a certain portion of the event that she did recall at trial.

So I want to focus on the testimony of Cypress Smith that deals with the charge of attempted rape in the first degree which is the third count of the indictment that you will have to consider in this case.

Cypress Smith testified about how she let Mr. Harrell into her house because he was a family friend, and they had a smoothie together, and when she gets into the sexual contact that took place between the two parties, she indicated at first that he kissed her, and by her testimony it was by force; that he also put, she believed two fingers into her vagina, and after testifying about Mr. Harrell allegedly putting two fingers into her vagina this is what she said. Starting at the bottom of Page 63 of the trial transcript

Amalia Hudson, SCR

1

Line 24:

'''A

2

''O So what happened next?

4

3

I kept telling him stop. He kept saying that I

5

like it and that I wanted this, and if I say, "No, I didn't

Then he put his mouth on my vagina and his

6

he would say, "Yes, You did.

7

''O What do you mean?

8

9

10

"Yes, you did want it. I said, "No, I didn't, and he said,

11

"Yes, you did again."

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

''A If I say, "Stop." He would say, "You wanted I would -- and I said, "No, I didn't, and he said,

So the point of me reviewing that part of the testimony is to show that Ms. Cypress Smith indicated that she first had experienced actually being kissed then having Mr. Harrell put two fingers into her vagina, and then his mouth on her Then the prosecutor directed a question to her because she left something out of the narrative. At least in the sequence that the prosecution has presented for your consideration. They're going to claim it happened in a certain linear sequence, and on a number of occasions Ms. Smith consistently left out certain portions or got the order of things mixed up.

So the question was, "Before he put his mouth on your vagina, did anything else happen?

'''A He took out his penis, and he rubbed it against

Amalia Hudson, SCR

A776

. []

me.

So she had to be prompted to recall the penis to the vagina content.

"Q He rubbed it against you where?

"A On my vagina, and I asked him not -- I asked him not to put it in because it would hurt. He said, it won't hurt if you relax again.

"Q Did his penis touch your vagina?

"A Yes.

"Q Did his penis go into your vagina.

"A No."

So let me just remind you that when I examined Susan Barbato, the detective from Special victims who interview Cypress Smith at the hospital I asked the detective to review the paperwork of an exhibit for the purposes of identification to review it without reading it out loud, and then I asked her, "Isn't it a fact that Cypress Smith never mentioned to you any type of contact between penis and vagina." And she said, "Yes, that wasn't mentioned to me." And I believe on redirect the prosecutor asked her "Well, you just took a narrative statement from her. You didn't — meaning that you didn't question her step by step about every detail. You just took a narrative, and that was left out?"

So you can consider that when you assess the credibility of the witness. That portion of allege sexual assault wasn't

Amalia Hudson, SCR

mentioned to the Detective Barbato, and it will appear in the medical records.

There is a number of things I want to discuss with you. First, I want to stay on point regarding what the complaining witness didn't say at certain times in the medical records. Okay. There is — in the medical record there is a pre-hospital care report summary which apparently is prepared by the hospital. Not the hospital the E.M.T.s the ambulance guys or gals who transported Cypress Smith to the hospital, and they took information from her before she was handed off to treatment at the hospital, and on Page 2 of the pre-hospital care report summary that is in evidence, they took a narrative from the complaining witness that goes through a great deal of what Ms. Smith said at trial, and I can read it to you quickly:

"Fifteen-year old female, alert an oriented times three again POS, is that positive, or is that possible, I Don't Know. POS ABC negative SOB. SOB is shortness of breath. Raped by adult male --

Again the Judge will instruct you on definitions of all of the crimes in this case. The defendant is not charged with rape, but that is what was written down — by a male known to her from the building she lives. Patient states she was forced by a male to perform oral sex on him and forcibly performed oral on the victim.

Amalia Hudson, SCR

Patient states the patient — I guess it means perpetrator choked her, pulled her pants down, placed her on a stool. Performed oral sex on the victim. Forced her to her knees and instructed the victim to perform oral sex on him.

Patient states she thinks the male ejaculated in her mouth, but she is not sure is. Patient is complaining of pain to the right side of the neck, POS either positive or possible redness to the right side of the neck. Denies lost of the consciousness. Denies neck and back pain. Denies chest pain."

That narrative does not indicate any contact between the defendant's penis and the complaining witness's vagina, and in one other portion of the medical records is an area of the report entitled Pages 1 through 6, and on Page 4 of 6 there is another narrative section where there is a note. I believe from looking at the records the note was prepared by a registered nurse, and the note says:

"Patient let neighbor in who is a friend of her brother.

Upon leaving assailant gave her a hug but wouldn't let go.

Forced her into chair. Performed oral sex with her. Then made her perform oral sex on him with him ejaculating in her mouth. No vaginal penetration with penis. Used fingers only. Presently with mother and police officer calm but slightly teary. Several scratches noted to her right cheek.

Amalia Hudson, SCR

States he was choking her."

(Proceedings continued next page)

Amalia Hudson, SCR

A780

Summation - The Defense

MR. HERLICH: So, that narrative, again, is a second narrative in the medical record where the patient failed to disclose that there was any contact between defendant's penis and the complaining witness' vagina.

And I'm only submitting that to you as an omission to consider the credibility of the witness who -- who omitted twice in the medical records and two interviewers and to Detective Barbato that she didn't mention that part of it. So that's something to consider whether anything of that nature actually took place or not.

Now, let me discuss the count of attempted rape in the first degree. I already read you the complaining witness' testimony on that. I just want to read you the cross-examination. I mean, I hope you remember, and I don't know if you can see from your position in the jury box, but when I was questioning Cypress Smith, I was using my hands because she had testified that he rubbed his penis against her vagina.

And I said to her -- I asked her: Was it like this, meaning like penis against vagina like this, or was he trying to insert his penis into her vagina. I wanted her to be very clear about that. And this is what I asked her, from page 90 at the bottom going forward:

"Question: Now, you indicated during your direct testimony that Mr. Harrell's penis had -- he rubbed his

Joanne Fleming

penis against your vagina. Did you see that or you just felt the event?

"Answer: I saw it.

"Question: And to the extent I am able to demonstrate, was Mr. Harrell's penis rubbing against your vagina as I am demonstrating with my hands, or was it in a way where he was trying to insert his penis into your vagina?

"Answer: The first demonstration, and then as he moved to -- as it seemed like he was trying to insert his penis into my vagina, I asked him to stop.

"Question: And when you asked him to stop, in fact he did stop, isn't that fair to say?

"Answer: Yes."

So, if you fully credit the testimony of the complaining witness, my argument to you at the end of the case is that while there may have been penis to vagina contact by the defendant going like this and she acknowledged that by saying yes, the first demonstration, meaning penis rubbing against vagina, I will repeat her words: "Then as he moved to -- as it seemed like he was trying to insert his penis into my vagina, I asked him to stop."

So, it wasn't clear to me from her answer how far, if at all, he got in doing any type of penis to vaginal

Joanne Fleming

contact which was directed or aimed at inserting his penis in her vagina, but as soon as she asked him to stop, he -- unlike with regard to her testimony about every other act that's alleged in the indictment, as to this particular act, he -- he honored her request and did not try to use forcible compulsion to have his penis inserted into her vagina.

So, based on that, I would ask that you return a verdict of not guilty as to attempted rape in the first degree even if you fully credit her testimony regarding everything that happened in this case.

Let me just go through some other things in the medical record that you will have an opportunity to review, it's in evidence and you can review it in the jury room.

I believe when the complaining witness first comes to the hospital, she did complain of pain. I believe on page three of six of the hospital record, on page three of six, she tells a nurse: Patient states man also choked her and her throat hurts.

So, in the hospital record as distinct from the ambulance record, as I already read, she complained of possible pain to the right side of her neck. In the hospital record, the complaint is about a sore throat, and the pain six. On a scale of zero to ten, the pain was six. And that was at 3:40 p.m., the pain at 9:28 p.m. was one out of ten and shortly thereafter at -- prior to her discharge,

Joanne Fleming

2.4

it was zero out of ten. So, the sore throat pain that was complained of initially had abated completely by the time she was discharged.

May I see the photographs?

(Counsel conferring with counsel.)

MR. HERLICH: Okay, on the part of the medical record that is entitled pages one through seven -- one of seven -- going to page one, there is an indication that right cheek abrasion with a scratch.

Okay, with regard to genital exam, no lesions noted. No injuries to her vaginal area. This is from the comprehensive sexual assault assessment form which is one through six of.

On page three, again it says abrasion to right cheek, otherwise well appearing. Abrasion, scratch on right cheek. I think it's in the ambulance report again where -- on the ambulance report, as I indicated, complains of pain to right side of neck, possible redness to the right side of the neck.

So here's a photograph taken at the hospital regarding Cypress Smith's right cheek. I mean, you're the jurors, you'll decide what it shows. It's hard for me to say what it shows. I don't know if it indicates a scratch or some area of redness on her right cheek. It appears to me that there's absolutely no redness on the right side of

her neck which was mentioned in the ambulance report.

Now, when Dr. Singh testified, and let me just give you the comprehensive sexual assault assessment form narrative. It is a little hard to read, but it says:

Patient was making Smoothie. Allowed neighbor in who asked for Smoothie that patient was making. Patient was threatened by neighbor. Neighbor then asked patient to undress. Neighbor asked patient to perform oral sex on him and then neighbor performed oral sex on patient. Penis contacted vagina, no penetration. Neighbor ejaculated during oral sex. No penetration on exam or ejaculation.

So, in this narrative in the comprehensive sexual assault assessment form the complaining witness does mention that there was penis to vagina contact. And that's the only place in the report that that's mentioned. In the other two narrative parts of the hospital record, it was left out.

But Dr. Singh, who came into the hospital approximately 7:00 p.m., is when she came into contact with the complaining witness in this case, and she testified:

Before my arrival, the intern who was working with me conducted the original physical examination of the complaining witness and the physical examination of the complaining witness, in Dr. Singh's own words, is a head-to-toe examination, and in this head-to-toe examination conducted by Dr. Singh's intern, there was no indication of

any kind of injury, scratch, abrasion to the back of Cypress Smith's neck.

Now, as Cypress Smith then -- there's one little, maybe not so little inconsistency, between the testimony of Cypress Smith and her mom. When I asked Cypress Smith about the scratch on the back of her neck, she -- I asked her: Do you know -- your mom took that photograph, do you know when your mom took the photo. She said at the hospital. And I said: Was this during your initial visit to the hospital or, you know, the follow-up. She said during the initial visit, which isn't what mom said.

Mom said -- on the next day mom indicated -that's Laketa Smith -- indicated that there were two
appointments. There was one appointment where she went for
a medical examination or a medical follow-up, and that, by
the medical record itself from Spencer Cox Center For
Health, indicates that it took place at approximately -- the
medical --

I'm sorry, the social worker appointment was first, and the social worker met with Laketa Smith and Cypress Smith at approximately 1:31 p.m. and she took a narrative, a brief narrative, of the events of July 16th. This was the next day, July 17th, two-thirty-one in the afternoon, and that's where it says: Patient reports she's feeling okay about the incident. No particular concerns

reported or noted.

And apparently, according to mom's testimony, they left, they had lunch somewhere, they came back for the medical follow-up at approximately five-twenty-three in the afternoon at the Spencer Cox Center For Health, which is part of St. Luke's Roosevelt, and that's where they went through the prophylactic medications that Ms. Smith, Cypress Smith, would have to take to prevent any possibility of sexually transmitted diseases.

And, for the first time, and this is, again, around 5:23 p.m. on the seventeenth: Skin warm, excoriation on right cheek and another on back of neck right side, some scabbing, neck supple, tenderness with palpation to the posterior side.

So, on touching or probing the back of her neck with the doctor's hands, palpation, there was some tenderness, and, for the first time, there is a notation about the scratch, and I submit the testimony of Laketa Smith is that she brought that to the attention of the doctor because she testified that she took the picture while she and her daughter were walking on the sidewalk or on the street to the Spencer Cox Center and she noticed this on the back of her daughter's neck, but it was not noted during the physical examination at the hospital on the day of the incident. It wasn't noted by the person who did the

physical exam.

And then when Dr. Singh performed the fifteen steps of the sex offense forensic evidence kit, colloquially known as the rape kit, she, on two independent occasions during the course of the fifteen-step exam, Dr. Singh had Cypress Smith disrobe completely and had an opportunity to view her, and on neither of those two occasions did Dr. Singh observe the scratch to the back of Cypress Smith's neck.

So, there is a question, I submit, whether that scratch existed or it was as a result of the events in the apartment between Lonnie Harrell and Cypress Smith or whether this scratch took place after she was discharged from the hospital and prior to coming into the Spencer Cox Center the next day. It's impossible to know the answer to that question, I submit to you.

Dr. Singh said it's easy to overlook a scratch on someone if it hasn't scabbed up, it might not be observable, but there were three opportunities to look during the physical exam by the intern and twice during the two of the steps of the forensic exam where Cypress Smith had to disrobe. There was that injury, alleged injury, that scratch, was never observed.

And, finally, Laketa Smith, Cypress' mother, while she testified that she took the picture on the seventeenth

while walking in the street, she did not share it with the District Attorney's Office until September of 2015, over a year after the incident in question. So, I'm not sure what to make of that, but I suggest that it's a possibility, it is a reasonable inference, that this scratch didn't result from what happened between the complainant and the defendant in the apartment on July 16th, 2014 at approximately two to two-fifteen to two-twenty in the afternoon.

I just have a few more comments to make on some of the forensic evidence in the case. Just briefly about the phone records. The phone records of the complaining witness indicate there was one call where maybe it rang once, twice. Nobody can know how many times it rang.

There is an alleged call between the defendant and the complainant, and according to the complainant's narrative, when the defendant was about to leave the apartment, he asked for her phone number, she gave it to him and he called it to make sure he had been given the correct number, and as soon as the phone rang, the call ended.

In the complaining witness' phone records, that brief call is noted to have taken place, I believe at two-twenty in the afternoon. In the defendant's phone records, that call does not appear, although there are ten calls from the defendant's phone to the complaining witness', Cypress Smith's phone, beginning, I believe, at

2:23 p.m. and going to -- let me give you the precise time -- there are ten phone calls of the records of the defendant's phone to Cypress Smith's where the ten calls go from 2:23 p.m. and thirty seconds until 2:28 p.m. and thirty-five seconds. The call that's at two-twenty and fifty seconds doesn't appear.

And the phone, the original -- there were two phone related witnesses at trial. The first gentleman testified ultimately on cross-examination that new technology came into being prior to responding to a request for Cypress Smith's phone records and that's why they were able to get that call on Cypress Smith's phone. The request for the defendant's phone records was made back in January of 2015. The technology wasn't available at that time, therefore, that call doesn't show up.

But, he also admitted that once this new technology came on line which enabled them to get Cypress Smith's phone records that included that call, there was not a subsequent request for the defendant's records to sort of confirm that on his records the same call shows up. Maybe it's much ado about nothing, but it's interesting that on the defendant's records that initial call, which is a part of the complaining witness' testimony of how things went down in the apartment that day, that was not part of the defendant's phone record.

Let me also address the DNA evidence in this case.

Could I have this displayed, your Honor?

(Court officer complies.)

MR. HERLICH: With regard to the straw that was recovered from the glass on the kitchen counter, the DNA analysis was a full analysis of, I believe, fifteen loci or points on the chromosome that they're looking at or the chromosomes that they're looking at, and using the statistics that we used, Lonnie Harrell is the only person on the planet earth that could have contributed that DNA to the straw.

And, likewise to the rim of the coffee cup that was recovered from the trash can, same thing, Lonnie Harrell is the only person on planet earth that could have contributed that DNA.

So, there is no dispute that Lonnie Harrell came into her apartment and had a Smoothie with her and the DNA evidence supports that a hundred percent. The question: Is Lonnie Harrell -- well, there are a number of questions for your consideration in this case, but question number one:

Is Lonnie Harrell the contributor to the DNA that was recovered -- there was DNA from Lonnie -- not from Lonnie Harrell but from the crime victim in this case, the alleged victim, and there were three items: Dried secretion swab 1.4.1 from the bilateral labia, a dried secretion swab

1.4.3 from the bilateral labia and the vulva swab. Those three generated profiles that are up there and these are from Y chromosome analysis.

As the expert DNA witness testified, doing a full complement DNA analysis, the autosomal analysis, I believe, was the phrase she testified to, test for fifteen loci across the entire DNA double helix.

The labium and vulva swabs for the DNA of Cypress Smith, whatever DNA may have been there as well was masked by the overwhelming contribution of DNA from Cypress Smith. So, what they did at the OCME lab was to do these swabs, the vulva swab and labial swabs, and try to do special testing only designed to look at various loci or points on the Y chromosome that could only have come from a male, male donor A, and they developed a genetic profile using the Y chromosome analysis as to the labial which would be two labia swabs and the vulva swab.

And the biological material on those swabs was amylase, which is enzyme akin to saliva. The oral swab, which was from the swab remains fraction, and the actual — they take part of the Q-tip swab and actually test that for biological material, and that was positive for the presence of semen and that's what gave actually less genetic information for whatever reason.

As you see, there are a number of empty spaces in

the profile that was generated from the oral swab and the statistics reflect that, okay?

The statistics indicate, and this was brought out on cross-examination, and I'll note that the prosecutor didn't ask her witness about these statistics, so I did.

She did ask about the statistics from the full complement of fifteen point autosomal genetic profile because it showed Lonnie Carrell was the only person on planet earth that could have made that contribution to the straw and the coffee cup.

But, with regard to the Y chromosome analysis, with regard to the dried secretions from the bilateral labia and the vulva, the analysis, the statistical analysis, showed, okay, the Y STR. DNA profile of Lonnie Harrell matches the DNA profile of male donor A. He or one of his paternal male relatives could be the source of this DNA.

Then, when you look at the statistics, one in six hundred eighty-five African males, thousands of individuals in New York City, could have contributed that DNA to the labia and vulva of the complaining witness if you want to speak scientifically about this.

And the semen, the testing of the semen, the Y chromosomal testing of the semen, because there was even less points that they could actually determine in generating a Y chromosomal profile, one in three hundred twenty-one

African males could have contributed the DNA to the Y chromosome of DNA.

So, those statistics are even worse from the prosecutor's point of view. Thousands of people in New York City could have made the contribution, okay? And this record is in evidence and you can -- you will have a chance to look at the statistics.

I just want to go through, very briefly, I mean, one way of putting this very clearly is to say that as a result of the Y chromosomal analysis, Lonnie Harrell cannot be excluded as a contributor to that DNA profile. As the contributor, he can't be excluded but he can't be ruled in either. You can't rule him out, but it doesn't mean it's him that made the contribution.

It's very different when it comes to the straw and the coffee cup. He's the only person on plant earth who could have contributed the amylase, the saliva, to the coffee cup and the straw. And, in fact, Ms. Tamariz indicated that the Y STR profiles are useful especially for making exclusions of people, or, in this case, alleged inclusion. You can't rule him out.

So, I want to just give you one question and answer from page 336 at the bottom, it's the direct testimony of the expert DNA witness, Ms. Tamariz, and I'll comment on it:

"Question: And that -- we're talking about the Y chromosomal DNA analysis -- and that DNA, if you can tell us again how that DNA matched, the word matched, or how that related to that of Lonnie Harrell's DNA strain profile.

"So the profile that we recovered from the samples is the same as the profile of Mr. Harrell."

So, my comment would be: True, but it could be a bit misleading. Because if you look again at these numbers, the Y chromosomal analysis from Lonnie Harrell, yes, it matches the Y chromosomal analysis of the vaginal swabs, the vulva swab and the labia swabs on all of the points that were looked at, and on the oral swab, based on the swab taken from the complaining witness' mouth, like I said, there is a lot of missing data points.

But, all that can be said is that it does not exclude Lonnie Harrell, but to call it a match is a misleading term of art. Because the only match in this case with DNA is the match on the straw and the match on the coffee cup, so...

I just ask you to take into consideration that the Y chromosomal analysis gives you statistics that are almost meaningless, or, put another way, they don't rule out Lonnie Harrell and they don't rule out any Hispanic male relatives and they don't rule out thousands of African males simply in the confines of New York City, let alone in the United

States or in the world.

So, you're going to have to determine a couple of things: One: Did these acts take place. Did they take place by forcible compulsion. And by forcible compulsion, the Judge will instruct you on that meaning, but was it either through the use of force or the threat of force.

And I submit, or I ask you, to take into consideration the points I've made from the medical record and the testimony of the Detective Barbato and Dr. Singh, that the complaining witness, when she had given narratives of the events, didn't always give the exact same story. If she was consistent about one thing, she consistently left out the fact that there was even penis to vaginal contact at all in this case.

Secondly: I ask you to consider the fact that she, herself, the complainant, admitted that with regard to the alleged penis to the vagina contact, when she asked the defendant not to do it, not to insert his penis into her vagina, on that particular instance, he honored her request and did not use force or threat of force. He didn't in fact insert his penis in her vagina.

And with regard to use of force, the medical records should assist you in determining the credibility of the witness. She kept saying she was choked with two hands by the defendant and that the choking took place on two

occasions, I believe. From her testimony, it took place twice during the course of the alleged sexual assault, and to the ambulance people, at least, she complained of pain to the neck, to the right side of her neck and redness, but the photograph taken at the hospital only some hours later shows absolutely no redness to the right side of the neck.

And, again, I can't tell you what the picture shows you, but it doesn't appear to me to indicate scratches to her cheek. It's redness. It could be pimples. I can't tell. That's for you, the jury, to decide. But the photograph clearly shows no redness to the right side of her neck.

And, again, I've already called your attention to the fact that the scratch on her back, the upper back below the right rear side of her neck, was not noted by -- during the course of three examinations, one by the intern, two by Dr. Singh where the complainant was completely unclothed at the emergency room where they were looking specifically for injuries, because if they found any indicia of injury, they could photograph it, and the only photograph that's in evidence from the hospital is of the right cheek of the complaining witness.

So, look carefully at the medical records to determine whether the force that Cypress Smith claims was used during the course of this incident was in fact used.

submit to you that the evidence is consistent with the fact that force was not used.

She said she had a sore throat, but the pain level was zero when she was discharged from the hospital, and I think the record is also clear that -- it's consistent with the fact that she -- her genitalia were without any type of trauma. They were, and she appeared to be, other than the alleged abrasion on the side of her face, she was normal appearing or healthy appearing. And, for those reasons, that would be consistent with the findings that this was consensual sex between Lonnie Harrell and Cypress Smith.

Of course, if you find that the sex act took place, she was underage, and, as a matter of law, based simply on her age, without any requirement of forcible compulsion, the last two counts in the indictment, criminal sexual act in the third degree dealing with the defendant's mouth to the complainant's vulva and the defendant's penis to the complainant's mouth, the defendant would clearly be guilty of those two counts if you found that the sexual act testified by the complainant took place.

But, when it comes to the forcible compulsion issue, I ask you to look carefully at the medical record before -- entered for you to determine whether the People proved beyond a reasonable doubt that forcible compulsion was used during the course of this event.

And, if you find that there was no forcible compulsion, then you must find the defendant not guilty of all counts other than the last two counts that will be submitted for your consideration.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Herlich.

Ms. Park.

MS. PARK: She hadn't even had her Sweet 16th yet. She wasn't even old enough to drive. She just finished her first year of high school. She was only fifteen-years old.

She wasn't supposed to be calling Nine-One-One crying that someone had sexually assaulted her. She wasn't supposed to be telling a room full of uniformed cops that her neighbor had violated her. She certainly wasn't supposed to have swabs inserted in her vagina, and she wasn't supposed to come before you, face her attacker and tell you the intimate details of what happened to her that one horrific day last summer.

This is not what a fifteen-year old should look like. But it's Cypress' reality because it happened to her and evidence proves that the defendant is guilty.

My burden is twofold: One, I have to prove all the elements of all the crimes charged, and two, I have to prove identification, that the defendant was the perpetrator of all the crimes.

Let's start with the second one because this one is easy. I say it's easy because it's not really in dispute. This isn't a case involving a stranger. Cypress knows the defendant. He has known her from about 2009, 2010 until this incident occurs. He lived next door to her. He's been to her apartment before. He did maintenance work inside for the family. From the very beginning, Cypress said Lonnie is my neighbor. So identification, I submit to you, is not really in dispute. He's not claiming that someone else did this. It was me but I did not do it.

Next, all the elements of the crimes. The evidence in this case proves beyond a reasonable doubt each and every element. And let's start with who Cypress Smith is. Was she credible? Was she accurate? Was she reliable?

And the answer is a resounding yes, yes, yes.

She's that girl who does her homework in the room they call

The Learning Center. She is the girl who spent two weeks in

Montana volunteering for senior center and a day-care

center, building sheds in a Native American reservation.

She's the girl who wants to be productive even during her

summer vacation. So after coming back from Montana, she had

plans to go to summer camp. She's the girl who hopes to go

to college after she finishes high school.

But, you all saw her here. I ask you to go back to that Tuesday of last week. You know who she is. You

remember the way she spoke, her demeanor, the way she answered questions. She was quiet. Respectful. And I submit to you that she was credible.

You remember when she was on the stand at times she had her head down. When I asked her to talk about the sex acts, she had her head down and she was in tears. She cried. She could barely look in the defendant's direction, having to recall that day, that afternoon, when she was alone in the apartment being humiliated, violated, so terrified. It was a physical, visceral reaction to have to relive that moment.

We asked her to go back to that day. Tell us what happened. And she described every painful moment, both physically and emotionally.

And you can rely on her words. When I asked her to take a look around the courtroom, point to him and describe something that he is wearing, remember what she did?

She couldn't point to him. She barely looked in his direction. And she said black shirt. It was the first time she shed tears in this courtroom. Again, a visceral reaction to having to face her attacker. You cannot fake that, to face the man who violated her body in the worst way possible.

The defense would have you believe, because she

.

may have gotten one or two things out of order, that she is not to be credited. A lot of things happened that day. A lot of different sex acts. And she remembered each and every one and she described them for you in details.

Now, what motive does she have to lie? Did she look like she was having a good time up there? Do you think she wanted to be here and be questioned about what happened? Take a four-hour train ride from Massachusetts? Miss several days of school? In the presence of complete strangers? In the presence of the defendant? And then take another four-hour train ride back to Massachusetts?

People lie for a reason. They lie either to cover up something when they get caught or to gain a benefit.

None of that exists here. It's not as if her mother walked in on them having sex and she had to cry rape to not get in trouble. No one would have known what happened inside that apartment if Cypress didn't say anything.

Two: She gains nothing by coming in here testifying before you.

And Cypress also told you that she had a good relationship with the defendant. We all know before that day the defendant was a good neighbor. That is not in dispute. So, all the more reason she has no motive to lie about what happened. So you can credit her testimony.

Next: Was Cypress reliable? Was she accurate?

Again, the answer is yes, yes. Everything Cypress told you, almost everything, has been corroborated by other evidence.

When Cypress answered the door, the defendant was standing there with a blue -- with a coffee cup, and she described it as blue paper and it had white writing on it. She's careful. She pays attention to details.

The coffee cup -- and the police recovered that coffee cup from inside the kitchen garbage can. The rim of the coffee cup was swabbed and we obtained DNA that matched the defendant's. Again, corroborating the defendant.

She also told you that she made a Smoothie when the defendant came inside. She gave him some and she described the color of the straw. She said a purple straw.

Purple straw.

They swabbed the top of the straw and they got the defendant's DNA. And that was also recovered from the counter of the kitchen where Cypress said that she had left.

Now, Ms. Alynka Jean from NYPD lab told you that she also tried to swab the glass. We don't know how the glass broke, but it was intact when the cops recovered it from Cypress' apartment, but when -- by the time it reached the NYPD lab, it had shattered somehow.

Should the police have vouchered it better so it won't break? Probably. But Ms. Jean was still able to tell

you that she was able to figure out the rim of the cup.

And the fact that they were not able to get any DNA from the rim of the cup also corroborates her testimony. Because he used the straw to drink out of the Smoothie.

Now, Cypress also told you that defendant choked her. Ms. Laketa Smith testified that the next day, after the attack, she noticed the scratch on her neck. And she took a picture of it, and the defense attorney showed that to you earlier.

Dr. Singh told you that that injury was consistent with it occurring the day before the incident, that it was also consistent with a scratch by finger, and I submit to you that that injury was caused when the defendant had his hands around her throat.

Now, I submit at the hospital that they simply missed it. It wasn't a significant injury. They took note of her face because it was on her face.

Now, Cypress also said that she recalls the photograph of the neck injury being taken on July 16th at the St. Luke's Roosevelt Hospital. But a lot of what happened to Cypress that day, especially at the hospital, she went through physical exams, she was questioned by doctors, by detectives. She was simply mistaken.

But her mother, her mother remembered it. She told you she was very specific about it. She told you they

were walking on their way to Spencer Cox Clinic and that's when she noticed it and she took a photo of it.

Now, defense suggests that possibly somehow this photo was not taken the day after. Maybe it was fabricated somehow. She only told the hospital at the Spencer Cox Clinic, but not the District Attorney's Office, until recently.

But that makes sense. Ms. Smith is a mother who is concerned about Cypress' welfare. She noticed the physical injury so she's telling the hospital because they are the ones who treat her. She has no idea whether this photograph has any value or any weight in a criminal case. She is making concerns about her daughter's welfare.

You judge Ms. Smith's credibility. She is a working mother who raised Cypress and Journey. You saw the way she testified. She could have made the defendant out to be a monster, but she did not. She called him a good neighbor. That he hung out with her son. That she appreciated that he spent time with her son. So you can rely on her testimony.

And about the phone contacts between Ms. Smith and the defendant, that is of no moment. We know he was spending time with her son. So, of course, she's going to have his phone number. And he did maintenance work for the building. So, of course, he's going to have her number.

Now, you also heard Cypress tell you that the defendant grabbed her cheeks and squeezed them together to force his penis in her mouth. I submit to you that injury on her face, and if the photographs don't clearly show the injuries, read the medical records. The medical records make note of it. And that injury, I submit, was caused at that time when he grabbed her cheeks.

Defendant put his penis inside Cypress' mouth and ejaculated. She told you she felt a salty liquid inside of her mouth. And Ms. Tamariz told you that there was presence of semen. There was not enough to do a full DNA chromosomal profile like with the cup and the straw, but there was presence of semen, there was presence of male DNA, from her oral swab.

And she explained to you about the Y chromosome, and it's true, that it's not a direct match to the defendant. And I told you that in my opening statement, that it was simply consistent with his DNA, that it could be him or any of his paternal relatives.

But is he suggesting that he came into the apartment, had the Smoothie, coffee cup with him and then someone else came in and sexually assaulted her?

No, no one is saying that.

And it makes sense that only a slight trace of the semen was left in her mouth. Let's think about what

Τ,

happened between the time defendant ejaculated in her mouth and the time they swabbed her.

They took a swab from her mouth. Cypress told you that she spit out the ejaculate onto her underwear. And we know the defendant took the underwear with him because the police did not recover it. And Cypress told you that he took it with him. About four hours had past before the swabbing. And, lastly, she drank water before she was swabbed.

Ms. Tamariz told you about the mouth area and why they typically don't recover any foreign DNA. You're constantly swallowing, talking, eating, spitting. So all of this stuff will increase the chance for you to wash away whatever foreign DNA could be in there.

But you know what?

You don't need an expert to tell you that. You don't need an expert to tell you that. Think about it.

Close your mouth and don't swallow. See how long you can keep it there. Because after a few minutes, saliva will develop and you will have to either swallow or spit it out.

Cypress also told you that the defendant put his fingers inside her vagina and rubbed his penis against her vagina. You heard testimony again from Ms. Tamariz about the Y strain. Presence of male DNA. Male chromosome from the vulva swab and the labia swabs. Her genital areas.

The forensic evidence isn't about proving who did it. We're not -- we're not saying if that -- that this evidence, the Y strain evidence, proves that the defendant is the person who perpetrated the crime. Identity is not an issue. There is presence of male DNA and that's to show you that sex acts occurred. Every area that Cypress told you that he touched, there is presence of male DNA, her oral swab and the swabs from her vaginal area.

Cypress also told you that defendant asked for her phone number and called to make sure that she gave the correct number. Once her phone rang, he hung up. And you all saw the phone records. Cypress' phone records that showed a call from the defendant's phone at 2:20 p.m., an incoming from the defendant's call.

And Mr. Sierra from T-Mobile, he explained to you about that call. He demonstrated how it was as if a caller called the number and hung up after the first ring.

And that he explained that the call did not appear in Cypress' call detail records or the defendant's cell site records or his call detail records because it never got picked up by the device, meaning Cypress never picked up the phone, nor did it ever go to his voice mail because he let it ring, made sure she gave the correct number and hung up.

Cypress' records, which he called the media cell site records, the technology didn't exist at the time the

defendant's cell site records were pulled. So what's the suggestion, that Cypress' media records, the cell site records, have somehow been fabricated?

It's T-Mobile records. It's in evidence. You can examine it.

Now, after defendant left Cypress' apartment, she called Nine-One-One. We know that Cypress called Nine-One-One from her cell phone at 2:23:29 p.m. You heard that Nine-One-One call and that call lasted less than ten minutes.

From 2:23:30 p.m. to 2:28:35 p.m., five minutes, the defendant called Cypress' phone ten times, all going to voice mail, and those calls are reflected in the defendant's phone records because it made contact with Cypress' device. It went to her voice mail and I believe it went to her voice mail because she's on the phone with Nine-One-One.

I submit to you that Cypress' words alone convict the defendant of every single charge that he's charged with. Her testimony before you is all you need to find the defendant guilty.

And, as compelling as she was, as convincing as she was, you don't need to rely on her words alone because you have all the other evidence which, of course, are her words. There are nine ways that we know that nothing Cypress did or the defendant did to her was consensual. She

was compelled to engage in sex against her will by force. 1 One: Cypress' demeanor and manner in which she 2 testified in court. 3 The Nine-One-One call. 4 Three: Officer Castillo and Lora's description of 5 6 Cypress. Four: Officer Semper-Martinez' description of 7 8 Cypress. Five: Cypress undergoing the SAFE exam. 9 Cypress' injuries. 10 Her mother's actions. Seven: 11 Eight: Her father's actions. 12 And, nine: Defendant's flight. 13 I will start with the first one, Cypress' demeanor 14 and manner in which she testified here. I already went over 15 it and I just ask you to recall the moment when she took the 16 17 stand. Cypress' Nine-One-One call immediately after 18 the defendant left the apartment. And I'm going to play a 19 20 portion of it in a minute. And this time I ask you to just not listen to her words, but to listen to how she is 21 speaking, what she must have been feeling, the way she is 22 whispering, the way she begs the operator: Please, please, 23 don't send the sirens. You can feel her fear. She is 24 25 scared that the defendant will find out that she is calling

the police.

1

And the call is also so obvious that she is just a 2 child wanting her mother. Can I please hang up and call my 3 4 mom? (Whereupon, the Nine-One-One call was played in 5 6 open court.) MS. PARK: That is not a call of someone who just 7 had consensual sex. That is a call for help by a child who 8 was just sexually assaulted. If it was consensual, why 9 would Cypress call Nine-One-One? 10 How many people call Nine-One-One after having 11 12 consensual sex? People don't do that. They call Nine-One-One to 13 get help. 14 Defendant wants you to believe that somehow maybe 15 this was all an act. That when he left the apartment, maybe 16 everything was fine. But listen to that Nine-One-One call. 17 That is not an act. That is the way she was feeling at that 18 moment, the fear you can feel. 19 And I can stop right here. That Nine-One-One call 20 with her testimony is all you need to know that every single 21 thing that happened in that apartment was by force. 22 23 there's more. We have Officer Castillo and Officer 24 Three: 25 Lora's testimony. They were the first officers to arrive.

And you actually heard them knocking on the door in the Nine-One-One call towards the end of that call.

When Cypress opened the door, Officer Castillo described her to be crying uncontrollably and saying repeatedly: Is he gone, is he gone, come inside.

Officer Castillo told you that it was police procedure to not lock the door for their safety. But, because she was shaking so much, he felt that he had to do what she had asked and he allowed her to lock the door.

Officer Castillo also told you that she could barely speak, speaking almost in a whisper. Tears on the side of her face. Boogers coming out of her nose. Can you picture it?

Officer Lora described her as crying, nervous, shaking. She couldn't really get the words out of her mouth. She was shaking. She was scared. You can feel the fear that Cypress felt at that moment. And, again, those actions are not someone who just had consensual sex but someone who was sexually assaulted.

Four: Officer Semper-Martinez' testimony. She and her partner, Officer Mateo, arrived shortly after the first two officers. They thought a female officer would make Cypress feel a little more comfortable.

And Officer Semper-Martinez described Cypress as follows: Shaken up, she was crying, her voice was very low,

she was shaking.

And Mr. Herlich asked these two officers about notes. How can you remember this from over a year ago without taking any notes? The question is: Not how can you remember this. The better question is: How can you forget her?

Five: Cypress undergoing the SAFE exams. Cypress arrived at the hospital about 3:40 p.m., left about midnight, one o'clock. She was in the hospital for over eight hours.

In addition to undergoing physical exams for about two hours, she had to undergo the SAFE exams. It was a very invasive SAFE exam which included getting her private areas swabbed, getting her pubic hair combed, standing in front of a doctor naked, full exposed.

And Dr. Singh went over with you all the fifteen steps that had to be done.

I submit to you that someone who just had consensual sex is not subjecting herself to that. Someone who was sexually assaulted is.

Six: Cypress' injuries. While her injuries were not significant, she had injuries that was consistent with what the defendant did to her.

And I don't have to prove to you physical injuries. The scratch on the back of her neck right side,

her medical records says that patient is complaining of pain to the right side of the neck, possible or positive redness to the right side of the neck, abrasion, scratch to the right cheek, all consistent with the defendant's hands on Cypress.

There was no injuries to Cypress' vagina. Cypress told you that he never penetrated her with his penis.

However, he did penetrate her with his fingers.

And remember what Dr. Singh told you about that?

That you would not expect to see genital injury with finger penetration. She said that the finger might not cause any trauma. The area tends to heal very quickly. In most cases of sexual assault, it's very rare to see any evidence of injury. And she also said the lining of the vagina is pretty elastic so it doesn't easily tear or get injured.

Seven: Cypress' mother's actions. Ms. Laketa

Smith testified that she rushed home after she received that

phone call from the police officer and Cypress. And you can

see from Cypress' call detail records, which is in evidence,

that at 2:37:13 p.m., she called her mother and her mother's

phone number ends in seven-four-seven-five. Ms. Smith told

you that Cypress sounded scared, like she had been crying,

her voice was shaky and kind of broken.

When Ms. Smith saw Cypress in the apartment, she described her as physically shaking, it was clear that she

had been crying. Her face was swollen and her eyes were red.

And Ms. Smith broke down on the stand when she said that she has never seen her daughter in that state before. Can you imagine what a mother must have felt at that moment? Feeling so helpless, not having been able to protect her daughter? Watching the aftermath of her daughter having gone through something so horrific?

Ms. Smith's reaction speaks volumes about the non-consensual nature of the sex acts.

She also told you that she took about two and a half to three weeks off from work to make sure that Cypress went to all of her appointments and not wanting Cypress to be alone. Again, you are not going to appointments if the sex was consensual.

Eight: Cypress' father's reaction. Both Cypress and her mother told you that her father, who at that time lived in Georgia, rushed to be by Cypress' side. Again, evidence that Cypress was sexually assaulted.

And finally, nine: Defendant's flight. We know from defendant's cell sites that he's still at Ninety-Two St. Nicholas Avenue. So I'm going to ask you to look at the cell sites with me.

We know from his cell sites that at 2:23:30 he's still at Ninety-Two St. Nicholas Avenue. You heard from Mr.

Delitta, the cell site expert, that these five calls were hitting the cell tower right here at One-Sixteenth and St. Nicholas Avenue -- actually, between One-Sixteenth and One-Fifteenth and St. Nicholas Avenue, and if you're at Ninety-Two St. Nicholas Avenue, you would most likely hit that tower or possibly through this tower.

When I asked him about this cell tower, the one at One-Eighteenth and Lenox Avenue, he said it most likely would not hit that tower if you were at Ninety-Two Second Avenue.

So, we know by 2:25:23 p.m., which is after five calls to Cypress' phone, all going to voice mail, that he is starting to move. And by 2:42:42 p.m. he is on the other side of Manhattan, and he's using the tower that's located at One-Twentieth and First Avenue, and Mr. Delitta told you about the range of that cell tower, three to four block radius.

So, the defendant is somewhere in this area, not here. And that's two forty-two, which is about fifteen minutes after he left the apartment.

Now, what do these cell sites tell you?

I submit that after he left Cypress' apartment, he gets concerned. He thinks maybe Cypress will call someone and that's why he starts making that call. And he panics, she's not picking up.

And we all know from having cell phones, or having used cell phones, that when you're trying to call someone, there is a specific ring tone that the other side makes. If that person is on the line, it will just ring and go beep or something like that. And that's what he heard. So he knew she was on the phone. And that's why they are -- in that five minute time period, he's calling Cypress ten times. And he's starting to make his way across town.

I submit to you that the defendant realized that it's only a matter of time before the police arrive at the apartment and that's why he ran, because he knew what he had done was wrong, that there was no consensual sex of any kind.

Now, there's something else that is noteworthy about that call at 2:42:42 p.m. That was the last call on that phone. There are no more phone calls from that phone. Why is the defendant all of a sudden not using that phone?

I submit to you he doesn't want to be tracked. He has to get rid of that phone. It contains the evidence that he committed a crime. It has naked photos of Cypress and it has calls that he made to Cypress.

And we know that the defendant had that phone at least as far back as February of 2014, and, all of a sudden, at 2:42:02 p.m., fifteen minutes after the assault, the phone goes dead?

Summation - The People

You might be asking: And why would the defendant have done this?

And I don't have to prove motive to you. But who knows why people do what they do. Who knows why people commit crimes. Why people do such horrible things.

And I submit to you that, here, the defendant saw an opportunity. He went -- he saw Cypress was alone, and having been so close to the family, he knew the mother wasn't home. He knew she wasn't going to be home for hours. He knew Journey wasn't home. He knew Journey wasn't going to be home. And he thought he could get away with it. He thought he had sufficiently silenced her by threatening her, by saying: If you tell anyone, I'm going to hurt your mom. If you tell anyone, I'm going to show these naked pictures of you and everyone will know what you have done.

Cypress was overcome with fear that day and she did what her instinct told her to do, and that was to call Nine-One-One.

There you have it, nine ways that we know the sex acts was not consensual. You didn't need them all, but you have them.

Now I'm going to go through the elements of the crime and I'm going to start backwards. I'm going to start with the statutory counts.

Now, count seven, that's criminal sexual act in

Joanne Fleming

A818

the third degree. This is the penis to mouth contact. And was there contact between the defendant's penis and Cypress' mouth?

Cypress testified that he put his penis in her mouth -- yes, that he grabbed her mouth and put his penis in her mouth. So, for this charge, no force is necessary.

Defendant was twenty-one years old or older.

Detective Barbato told you that when she arrested the defendant, she took pedigree information from him and that included his date of birth. His date of birth was December 27, 1962 which makes him fifty-one at the time of the crime.

And you saw the defendant when he was in court.

He appears to be his stated age. So there is no doubt that
the defendant was twenty-one years old or older at the time
of the crime.

Cypress was less than seventeen-years old.

Cypress told you that her date of birth was April 21st,

1999. Her mother told you that she was born on April 21st,

1999. The birth certificate prove that she was born on

April 21st, 1999. Which makes her fifteen on July 16th,

2014. So that element has been satisfied.

Count six, criminal sexual act in the third degree, and this will be the mouth to vulva contact. Was there contact between the defendant's mouth and Cypress' vulva?

Cypress testified that she felt his mouth and his tongue in her vagina. And although Cypress never used the word vulva, we know as adults what that term refers to, the external area, and I submit that at fifteen she doesn't know -- she doesn't know the difference between a vulva and a vagina.

And common sense tells us that in order to get to the vagina, you have to touch the vulva. You have to get past it. It's like -- I hate to be so graphic -- but it's like the Tootsie Roll candy. You can't get to the jelly part inside until you go through the hard part.

Again, for this charge, there is no requirement that any force be used.

Two: The defendant was fifty-one years old.

And, lastly, Cypress was fifteen-years old.

And for these charges, I don't have to prove to you that the defendant knew Cypress was fifteen-years old at the time of the crime, but I submit to you that he did know. He knew the family. He first met the family in 2009, 2010 and Cypress was only ten-years old at the time. He spent time talking to her about her school. He knows the family. So, I submit to you he knew she was fifteen-years old.

Count five, sexual abuse in the first degree.

This would be the mouth to mouth contact. Did the defendant subject Cypress to sexual contact? Is the mouth an intimate

part of a body? And was it for the purpose of gratifying sexual desire?

Mouth by itself is not necessarily an intimate part. You use it to eat, talk or kiss the baby. That's not considered an intimate body part. But, when the mouth is being used to kiss another person on the mouth in a way that it happened here, it is an intimate part.

This wasn't an innocent platonic kiss between Cypress and the defendant. She told you that he kissed her and put his tongue inside of her mouth. This is an intimate act so it involves an intimate body part. When you're kissing someone and that person's tongue is inside your mouth, there is no question that it's for a sexual gratification.

Two: Was there forcible compulsion?

Before he kissed her, a lot happened. He held onto her and wouldn't let go of the hug. She tried to push him away, but he held onto her. She told him to let her go, but he did not. She kicked his shin. He grabbed her shoulders. He choked her. Brought her down to the ground. She couldn't breath. He covered her mouth, told her not to scream. He threatened her, if she screamed, I'm going to choke you out.

When she tried to get away, he grabbed her ankle, pulled her towards him. He then grabbed her by her hair,

pulled her into The Learning Center where he forced her to sit on the stool.

In determining forcible compulsion, I also ask you to think about Cypress' age and her size compared to the defendant. She was only a child. He was an adult. She was five feet tall, hundred twenty pounds. He was at least five-six, hundred eighty-five pounds. She was alone, trapped in her apartment.

Cypress told you that she kept her mouth closed and he threatened to kiss -- he threatened her to kiss him back or he would choke her again. Of course she's going to be in fear that he would cause her physical injury. He already did. He was older, bigger, stronger. He overpowered her. He used physical force. He threatened her with physical force.

Any one of those acts alone constitute forcible compulsion. When you have them altogether, there is no doubt that forcible compulsion was used here.

Count four, sexual abuse in the first degree, finger to vagina. Now, was there contact between the defendant's fingers and Cypress' vagina?

I think we can all agree that a vagina is a sexual part of a person's body, and it might be stating the obvious, but when you stick your fingers inside someone's vagina, it's for sexual gratification.

Two: Was there forcible compulsion?

I just went over the forcible compulsion with you. And all of the defendant's actions are relevant here.

Even though the kiss came before the finger to the vagina contact, it's not as if she forgot about what the defendant did. It is still fresh inside Cypress' mind. She knows what he is capable of. She is compelled to do what the defendant tells her to do because of that fear.

But, what else is happening during this act?

Cypress cried. She told the defendant that it
hurt. And he told her if you relax, it wouldn't hurt. She
is crying and expressing pain. He is continuing to do this
act. Telling a fifteen-year old to relax. All of that
combined, there was lack of consent by forcible compulsion.

Count three, attempted rape in the first degree.

Did the defendant attempt to engage in sexual intercourse with Cypress?

And the Judge will define sexual intercourse for you, but it's any penetration, however slight, of the penis into the vaginal opening.

Cypress told you that the defendant's exposed penis rubbed against her vagina. She told you, very honestly, that his penis did not go in.

Defense argues that she said stop and he did.

That's not how it went. What she also said was she said it

seemed to -- it seemed like the defendant was trying to insert his penis in her vagina. She asked him to stop because it hurt. He told her it won't hurt if you relax.

And that's when he stopped and he didn't penetrate her. And that's why -- and that's why he's only charged with the attempted rape in the first degree.

Is there any doubt that he was trying to penetrate her?

Do you think his intent was to simply rub his penis against her and that's it?

Absolutely not. Rubbing your naked penis against someone's vagina is as close as you can come to penetrating them.

Defense pointed out that Cypress never told

Detective Barbato this and she didn't tell the hospital

personnel, one of the hospital personnel. But keep in mind

that Detective Barbato's interview took place three hours

after she had been sexually assaulted.

Ms. Laketa Smith's description of Cypress at the hospital is as follows: She was tired and she was scared and she sort of -- she seemed anxious. She shook a lot. She seemed shocked and dazed, like all of it was surreal. This was Cypress' condition when the detective and the doctors were interviewing her.

And Detective Barbato also told you that she was

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

simply giving you a narrative of what happened. It's not like a trial like here where I was asking her specific questions for a specific charge. They weren't asking for those details.

Besides, a lot happened inside the apartment.

Starting with the Smoothie, the physical force, the threats, the many, many different sex acts, taking pictures, the phone calls and so on. To suggest that Cypress is somehow lying or not being truthful about something because she left out that he rubbed his penis against her vagina is absurd.

And the medical records that Mr. Herlich pointed out for you earlier where she said -- where it said no vaginal penetration with penis but used fingers. And she's right. She never said that he penetrated her.

I submit to you that Cypress doesn't know, nor does she care, what elements are necessary for rape, for criminal sexual act. All she knows is what happened to her, and to her it's as simple as what she told the Nine-One-One operator: I was raped. She's not thinking about what constitutes element of rape in the first degree. She was violated. And like -- and you know the term rape is just commonly used for any sexual violation of a person's body, and that's what she was relating to the Nine-One-One operator and to the hospital personnel.

Two: Was there forcible compulsion?

Again, you have to consider all of the defendant's actions and I won't go through it. And, as I said under the sexual abuse counts, Cypress knows very clearly what the defendant is capable of and she is still under that fear.

Count two, criminal sexual act in the first degree. This would be the penis to mouth contact. Was there oral sexual conduct?

Of course. The defendant put his penis in Cypress' mouth. That's oral sexual conduct.

Was there forcible compulsion?

In addition to the force and threats that the defendant employed up to this point, there was additional force used for this contact. Cypress told you that the defendant told her to stand up, he grabbed the back of her neck, then we saw Cypress attempting to fight back. She said that she tried to grab his testicles and twist. She saw it and she learned it in self-defense or karate class. She thought that would stop him.

Unfortunately, it didn't work, because it caused him to grab her neck harder. When she refused to get on her knees, the defendant grabbed her hair and pushed her down to her knees. While she was on her knees in front of him, he grabbed her face, and she demonstrated for you, putting his fingers on both sides of her cheeks and he squeezed, causing her mouth to become open and he shoved his penis in her

Summation - The People

mouth, then he grabbed her neck harder, pushing her head down so his penis would go further. That's what she told you. That he kept pushing her head so his penis would go deeper.

Finally, count one, criminal sexual act in the first degree. This would be the mouth to vulva contact.

Now, as we went over under count six, Cypress testified that the defendant put his mouth and his tongue on her vagina.

Was there forcible compulsion?

Again, we went over this many times, but what else did she say while the defendant -- while the defendant's mouth was on her vagina?

In Cypress' words: If I say stop, he would say you wanted this. And I said no, I didn't. And he said yes, you did want it. I said no, I didn't. He said yes, you did.

Now, about forcible compulsion, during jury selection we talked about whether you would expect the victim of a sexual assault to fight back. Now, you also said you would keep an open mind.

Cypress was alone in the apartment with the defendant. She was only fifteen, just a child. He was an adult, bigger and stronger. He had already shown her that he could overpower her, that he could hurt her. He had

instilled in her fear that he would hurt her even more if she did not comply.

She told you that she was scared. He had threatened her during the assault. He would keep choking me. He would choke me out. He would go berserk if I didn't do what he said. She had no choice. Don't fault her for not fighting back hard enough. She did what she thought was necessary to survive, and she did.

But, you know what?

She did fight back. She called Nine-One-One, she told the police what happened and she came before you and told you what the defendant did to her.

When Cypress Smith took the stand last week, she was only sixteen-years old. It's not easy getting on the witness stand and having to testify in front of strangers, and we saw some of that in some of the police officers. But Cypress told you what happened to her. And you all know it wasn't easy for her because she had tears in her eyes.

When we began this trial, the defendant stood before you presumed innocent and I told you in my opening statement what I expect the evidence would show. But what I said in my opening is not evidence. It only became evidence when witnesses took the stand and when the physical evidence came in.

The defendant had his fair trial. He is no longer

presumed innocent because the evidence proves his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Cypress' testimony alone proves his guilt. Every single one. If you believe her, the defendant is guilty, as I submit you should.

But, rest assured in knowing that this evidence corroborates her testimony: Nine-One-One call, Officer Castillo and Officer Lora, Officer Semper-Martinez, her mother, the medical records, irrefutable forensic evidence, the cell site records.

Now the time has come to do what you have all promised to do, what you have all been chosen to do, and to do what the evidence commands you to do, and that is to tell Cypress we heard you, we believe you, the defendant is guilty. Find him guilty.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Park.

Okay, jurors, you heard the summations, however, you're still required to continue to follow my instructions and my admonitions to you because you have not yet heard the jury charges; in other words, you don't know how to apply the facts as you find them to the law as I give it to you because I haven't given you the law yet.

We're going to take our lunch recess now and I
will ask you to please be back at three o'clock. When you
come back at three o'clock, I will give you the jury charges

and then I expect that you'll have at least half an hour, if

not more, to begin your deliberations this afternoon. 2 I remind you again to please continue to follow my 3 It may be really tempting now that you have instructions. 4 5 heard the summations and heard both sides rest to begin to discuss this case or express an opinion. I ask you to 6 resist that temptation and just put the case out of your 7 mind and I will see you at three o'clock sharp. 8 9 Thank you. A COURT OFFICER: Leave your books on the chairs, 10 make sure you have all your belongings and step this way, 11 12 please. (Whereupon, the jury exited the courtroom.) 13 THE COURT: Okay, thank you. 14 15 See you at three. 16 (Luncheon recess held.) AFTERNOON SESSION*** 17 18 THE CLERK: Continuing case on trial, People versus Lonnie Harrell. 19 Your Honor? 20 MR. HERLICH: 21 THE COURT: Yes? 22 MR. HERLICH: The only other thing that I'd ask 23 you to charge is that, again, what you said at the beginning of the case, that in the event the defendant didn't testify 24 25 they can't hold an adverse inference.

Jury Charge

1	THE COURT: Sure.
2	THE SERGEANT: Judge, Abe is outside waiting for
3	all the jurors.
4	THE COURT: Okay.
5	A COURT OFFICER: (Indicating.)
6	THE COURT: We're good, let's go.
7	A COURT OFFICER: Panel entering.
8	(Whereupon, the trial jury entered the courtroom.)
9	THE CLERK: Continuing case on trial, People
10	versus Lonnie Harrell.
11	All parties, except for the defendant, and all
12	jurors are present.
13	THE COURT: Good afternoon, jurors, welcome back.
14	Members of the Jury, I will now instruct you on
15	the law. I will first review the general principles of law
16	that apply to this case and all criminal cases. You have
17	heard me explain some of those principles at the beginning
18	of the trial. I'm sure you appreciate the benefits of
19	repeating those instructions at this stage of the
20	proceedings.
21	After that, I will define the crimes charged,
22	explain the law that applies to those definitions and spell
23	out the elements of each charged crime. Finally, I will
24	outline the process of jury deliberations. These
25	instructions will take forty-five minutes to an hour. You

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

will not receive copies of these instructions, but I can 1 repeat them for you as many times as you wish.

> During these instructions, I will not summarize the evidence. If necessary, I may refer to portions of the evidence to explain the law that relates to it.

My reference to evidence or my decision not to refer to evidence expresses no opinion about the truthfulness, accuracy or importance of any particular evidence. In fact, nothing I have said, and no questions I have asked, in the course of this trial were meant to suggest that I have an opinion about a witness, the evidence or of whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty. If you have formed an impression that I do have an opinion, you must put it out of your mind and disregard it.

The level of my voice or intonation may vary during these instructions. If I do that, it will be done to help you understand. It is not done to communicate any opinion of the law or the facts of the case or whether the defendant is quilty or not quilty. Remember, it is not my responsibility to judge the evidence here. It is yours. You are the judges of the facts and you are responsible for deciding whether the defendant is quilty or not guilty.

In your deliberations you may not consider or speculate about matters relating to sentence or punishment. If there is a verdict of guilty, it will be my

responsibility to impose an appropriate sentence.

The fact that the defendant did not testify is not a factor from which any inference unfavorable to the defendant may be drawn.

When you judge the facts, you are to consider only the evidence. The evidence in the case includes the testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits that were received in evidence and the stipulation by the parties.

Testimony which was stricken from the record or to which an objection was sustained must be disregarded by you.

Exhibits that were received in evidence are available upon your request for your inspection and consideration. Exhibits that were just seen during the trial or marked for identification but not received in evidence are not evidence and are, thus, not available for your inspection and consideration.

The testimony based on those exhibits that were not received in evidence may be considered by you. It is just that the exhibit itself is not in evidence.

In evaluating the evidence, you may consider any fact that is proven and any inference which may be drawn from such fact.

To draw an inference means to infer, find, conclude that a fact exists or does not exist based upon proof of some other fact or facts. For example, suppose you